



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,723	03/01/2002	Tony Gargya	DE920010003US1	6694

7590 06/01/2004
Jerry W. Herndon
IBM Corporation T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

MOFIZ, APU M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

5

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/087,723

Applicant(s)

GARGYA ET AL.

Examiner

Apu M Mofiz

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 13-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 12 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Apu Mofiz
Apu Mofiz
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2 & 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgement is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in the Hague on 08/10/01. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the European patent application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The disclosure is missing BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION, BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S) and the DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION headings for the corresponding section.

Appropriate correction is required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)),

Art Unit: 2175

and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or

REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a).

"Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)

(e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A

"Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

Art Unit: 2175

Or alternatively, Reference to a "Microfiche Appendix": See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.

- (e) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
 - (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
 - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (f) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (g) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (h) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly

Art Unit: 2175

complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

- (i) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (j) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (k) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Cape Clear (CapeConnect 1.0 Technical Overview, February 2001 and CapeClear hereinafter).

As to claim 1, CapeClear teaches a bridge (i.e. "*CapeConnect is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) business server that connects back-end computer systems to a semantically rich, Web-based infrastructure.*" ... "*CapeConnect uses XML to bridge the gap between the Internet and back-end systems.*" ... "*The CapeConnect servlet runs in a servlet engine on your Web server. It acts as a communication bridge between remote clients and the CapeConnect XML engine.*") (page 1; page 5) for coupling a client (4) (i.e. "*At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls.*") (page 2; page 3) of a first object type (i.e. "*Using SOAPDirect, you can integrate any Java-based program with back-end CORBA systems through the CapeConnect XML infrastructure.*") (page 3; page 14) to a server (8, 9) of a second object type (i.e. "*CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet.*" ... "*These elements connect server-side components, such as CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure.*" ... "*SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML.*") (page 3; page 14), the bridge (page 1; page 5) comprising a server component (11) (page 3; page 14; page 17) of the first object type (page 3; page 14), a client component (13) of the second object type (page 3; page 14) and a mapping component (17) (i.e. "*At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls. CapeConnect communicates with your CORBA objects, gathers the information that a client requires, and converts this information to a format suitable for client to process or a user to view.*" ... "*CapeConnect maps CORBA calls to corresponding Web communications.*") (page 2; page 11) for mapping (page 2; page 11) of objects of the first object type (page 3; page 14) to corresponding objects of the second object type (page 3; page 14).

As to claim 2, CapeClear teaches that wherein the first object type (i.e. *"Using SOAPDirect, you can integrate any Java-based program with back-end CORBA systems through the CapeConnect XML infrastructure."*) (page 3; page 14) uses the simple object access protocol (SOAP) type (i.e. *"Similarly, all CapeConnect XML communications comply with the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) 1.1 specification."*) (page 1; page 3).

As to claim 3, CapeClear teaches wherein the second object type (i.e. *"CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet."* ... *"These elements connect server-side components, such as CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure."* ... *"SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML."*) (page 3; page 14) is the enterprise Java Beans (EJB) type or the common object request broker architecture (CORBA) type (i.e. *"CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet. (The next release of CapeConnect will add support for EJBs.)"*) (page 3).

As to claim 4, CapeClear teaches wherein the bridge (i.e. *"CapeConnect is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) business server that connects back-end computer systems to a semantically rich, Web-based infrastructure."* ... *"CapeConnect uses XML to bridge the gap between the Internet and back-end systems."* ... *"The CapeConnect servlet runs in a servlet engine on your Web server. It acts as a communication bridge between remote clients and the CapeConnect XML engine."*) (page 1; page 5) has means for coupling to the client (i.e. *"At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls."*) (page 2; page 3) of the first object type (i.e. *"Using SOAPDirect, you can integrate any Java-based program with back-end CORBA systems through the*

CapeConnect XML infrastructure.") (page 3; page 14) via the internet (i.e. "*CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet.*") (page 3; page 14).

As to claim 5, CapeClear teaches wherein the bridge (i.e. "*CapeConnect is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) business server that connects back-end computer systems to a semantically rich, Web-based infrastructure.*" ... "*CapeConnect uses XML to bridge the gap between the Internet and back-end systems.*" ... "*The CapeConnect servlet runs in a servlet engine on your Web server. It acts as a communication bridge between remote clients and the CapeConnect XML engine.*") (page 1; page 5) has means for coupling to the server (i.e. "*CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet.*" ... "*These elements connect server-side components, such as CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure.*" ... "*SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML.*") (page 3; page 14) via an intranet (page 3; page 14).

As to claim 6, CapeClear teaches wherein the bridge (i.e. "*CapeConnect is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) business server that connects back-end computer systems to a semantically rich, Web-based infrastructure.*" ... "*CapeConnect uses XML to bridge the gap between the Internet and back-end systems.*" ... "*The CapeConnect servlet runs in a servlet engine on your Web server. It acts as a communication bridge between remote clients and the CapeConnect XML engine.*") (page 1; page 5) has an assigned uniform resource locator (URL) (i.e. "*A superset of URL, and a necessary part of the HTTP headers in a SOAP request.*") (page 27) for access of the bridge (page 1; page 5) from the client (i.e. "*At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls.*") (page 2; page 3).

As to claim 8, CapeClear teaches a receiving component (i.e. *"At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls. CapeConnect communicates with your CORBA objects, gathers the information that a client requires, and converts this information to a format suitable for client to process or a user to view."*) (page 2; page 11) for application specific parameters (i.e. *"When making a call to a CORBA object, a client usually sends input parameter values and then waits for a corresponding set of results. For example, a call that calculates the sum of two integers would take the two integer values as input and return a single integer value as a result."*) (page 10) to be provided to the server (i.e. *"CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet."* ... *"These elements connect server-side components, such as CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure."* ... *"SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML."*) (page 3; page 14) as input data (page 10).

As to claim 9, CapeClear teaches a client (i.e. *"At run time, information from a Web or SOAPDirect client is channeled to CapeConnect, which interprets the client's input and converts it to CORBA calls."*) (page 2; page 3) computer of a first object type (i.e. *"Using SOAPDirect, you can integrate any Java-based program with back-end CORBA systems through the CapeConnect XML infrastructure."*) (page 3; page 14) and a bridge (i.e. *"CapeConnect is an Extensible Markup Language (XML) business server that connects back-end computer systems to a semantically rich, Web-based infrastructure."* ... *"CapeConnect uses XML to bridge the gap between the Internet and back-end systems."* ... *"The CapeConnect servlet runs in a servlet engine on your Web server. It acts as a communication bridge between remote clients and the CapeConnect XML engine."*) (page 1; page 5) for establishing a communication (page 1; page 5) path between the client computer (page 2; page 3) and a server computer (i.e. *"CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet."* ... *"These elements connect server-side components, such as*

CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure." ... "SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML.") (page 3; page 14) of a second object type (i.e. *"CapeConnect 1.0 makes CORBA objects available to clients across the Internet or an Intranet." ... "These elements connect server-side components, such as CORBA objects, to a universal, Web-based infrastructure." ... "SOAPDirect, in conjunction with the CapeConnect servlet and XML engine, provides a HTTP-based transport for communicating with CORBA objects through XML."*) (page 3; page 14).

As to claim 10, CapeClear teaches a firewall component (18) (i.e. *"Communications between clients, the servlet, and the XML engine take place over HTTP, so you can place firewalls between these components without opening additional, insecure pathways."*) (page 3; page 5) in the communication path (page 1, page 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cape Clear (CapeConnect 1.0 Technical Overview, February 2001 and CapeClear hereinafter) in view of Larry Peterson ("A Yellow-Pages Service for a Local-Area

Network", Department of Computer Science, University of Arizona, 1988, ACM and Peterson hereinafter).

The teachings of CapeClear have been discussed above.

As to claim 11, CapeClear does not explicitly teach wherein the client computer has means for accessing a yellow pages type server for querying the yellow pages type server to obtain a uniform resource locator of a desired location of the server computer.

Peterson teaches that the client computer (i.e. "*Clients specify the attributes the server should possess when requesting a service and the yellow-pages service determines what servers satisfy the request.*") (page 235) has means for accessing a yellow pages type server (i.e. "*A set of servers implement the yellow-pages service.*") (page 235) for querying (i.e. "*We introduce a yellow-pages service that maps service names into server addresses.*" ... "*A client that wishes to engage a service queries the yellow-pages service for the address of a server, specifying the name of the service and any attributes the server should possess.*") (page 235) the yellow pages type server (page 235) to obtain a uniform resource locator of a desired location (i.e. "*We introduce a yellow-pages service that maps service names into server addresses.*" ... "*In addition to describing the implementation of the yellow-pages service within a local area network, we show how the service can be integrated with the available internet communication protocols to enable clients from throughout the internet to access local servers.*" ... *The yellow-pages service returns the address of one or more servers that satisfy the client's requirements.*" The preceding text indicates that the client queries for the yellow-pages server for the address of the intended service provider server. In the Internet environment the address is an URL.) (page 235) of the server computer (page 235).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of CapeClear with the teachings of Peterson to include that the client computer has means for accessing a yellow pages type server for querying the yellow pages type server to obtain a uniform resource

locator of a desired location of the server computer with the motivation to connect to the server that is willing to provide the service the client needs (Peterson, page 235) and because it is cost effective (Peterson, page 241).

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 13-17 are allowed over the prior art of records.

The following is a statement of reasons for allowance:

As to claim 13, Cape Clear (CapeConnect 1.0 Technical Overview, February 2001 and CapeClear hereinafter), and Larry Peterson ("A Yellow-Pages Service for a Local-Area Network", Department of Computer Science, University of Arizona, 1988, ACM and Peterson hereinafter) do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claims), coupling a client of a first object type to a server of a second object type via a bridge, which includes a server component of the first object type, a client component of the second object type and a mapping component for mapping of objects of the first object type to corresponding objects of the second object type, which include coupling the client to the bridge, providing a uniform resource locator of the server to the bridge and providing parameter data to the bridge indicative of the object type of the server, coupling the bridge to the server via the client component of the bridge having the same object type as the server.

8. Claims 7 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

As to claim 7, Cape Clear (CapeConnect 1.0 Technical Overview, February 2001 and CapeClear hereinafter), and Larry Peterson ("A Yellow-Pages Service for a Local-Area Network", Department of Computer Science, University of Arizona, 1988, ACM and Peterson hereinafter) do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claims), that the bridge includes a receiving component for the uniform resource locator of the server and for parameter data indicative of the second object type for selection of the second object type client component.

The closest prior arts fail to anticipate or render Applicant's limitations above obvious.

As to claim 12, Cape Clear (CapeConnect 1.0 Technical Overview, February 2001 and CapeClear hereinafter), and Larry Peterson ("A Yellow-Pages Service for a Local-Area Network", Department of Computer Science, 1988, ACM and Peterson hereinafter) do not disclose, teach or suggest the claimed limitations of (in combination with all other features in the claims), the computer system wherein the yellow page server provides the object type of the application and, in case of different server and client object types, the uniform resource locator of the bridge.


The closest prior arts fail to anticipate or render Applicant's limitations above obvious.

Points of Contact

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Apu M. Mofiz whose telephone number is (703) 605-4240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached at (703) 305-3830. The fax numbers for the group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.


Apu M. Mofiz
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100

May 27, 2004